

REMARKS

This Amendment and Response is responsive to the Office Action mailed February 28, 2005. In that Action: claims 10-22, 26-28, and 31-43 were pending; claims 10, 12, 31, 37, and 39-42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Um et al. (USPN 5,245,369); claim 26 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable under Ooi et al. (USPN 5,648,860); claims 11 and 13 were objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but noted as allowable if rewritten in independent form; and claims 14-22, 27, 28, 32-36, 38, and 43 were allowed.

Claims 11 and 13 have each been amended into independent form as they had been noted as allowable. Claims 10, 26, 31, 37, and 39 have been amended to even further distinguish over the prior art of record. Claim 32 and 42 have been amended to use language consistent with the amended claim from which they depend. Reconsideration of the rejections of the pending claims is hereby requested.

In examining the file, it is noted that there is still a Form-1449 from a Supplemental IDS filed by first class mail with an Amendment and Response on September 23, 2003 that has not been checked off and returned with a subsequent Office Action. In that filing, two sheets of 1449 forms were provided. The first sheet was checked off and returned with the March 19, 2004 Office Action. It is respectfully requested that the second sheet be checked off and returned as well. This has been requested numerous times previously. A telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated if we need to supply something further in this regard

Each of independent claims 10, 31, 37, and 39 have been rejected based on Um. Um appears to relate to a scene projector with a single broadband light source, a parabolic mirror and

an actuated mirror array.

Claim 10 is limited to a display system with a source of light including three LEDs, wherein each LED produces light of a different color. It thus believed that claim 10 is patentable.

Claims 31, 37, and 39 are each limited to display systems that generate a color image via a single microdisplay. It thus believed that claims 31, 37, and 39 are patentable.

Independent claim 26 has been rejected based on Ooi. Ooi appears to disclose a projection type color liquid crystal optical apparatus. In Fig. 22 of Ooi, the apparatus has three display panels on to which light from a light source is directed and which reflect images that are combined at an optical element for projection.


Claim 26, on the other hand, relates to a system in which a color image is generated by a single microdisplay. This was noted in the Statement of Reasons for Allowance in the pending Office Action. It thus believed that claim 26 is patentable.

Thus it can be appreciated that each of the rejected independent claims is distinguishable over the prior art and is patentable. Further, each of the dependent claims is patentable due to their dependence on the independent claims and the additional limitation found in the dependent claims.

Based on the foregoing comments, Applicants believe that all pending claims are in condition for allowance and such disposition is respectfully requested. In the event that a telephone conversation would further prosecute and/or expedite allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

MARSH FISCHMANN & BREYFOGLE LLP

By: 

Robert G. Crouch
Registration No. 34,806
3151 South Vaughn Way, Suite 411
Aurora, Colorado 80014
(720) 562-5506

Date: May 31, 2005